

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR
PHLAEOTHIRIPS UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 1741
(see present volume, pages 126-128)

By Lewis J. Stannard (*Illinois Natural History Survey, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

The request by L. A. Mound for invoking the plenary powers to suppress all previous type designations for *Phlaeothrips* Haliday, 1836, and instead to designate *Phlaeothrips coriacea* Haliday, 1836, and to ratify the long accepted designation of *Trips corticis* De Geer, 1773, nec Amyot and Serville, 1843, as the type-species of *Hoplothrips* are solutions to nomenclatural problems that require decision under the present Code. Previously in 1957 I proposed, as an alternative solution, that the species named by Blanchard, *Thrips ulmi* Fabricius, 1781, be recognized as the valid type-species for *Phlaeothrips*. I had followed Hood's line of reasoning (1915) when he attempted to fix *Trips corticis* De Geer as the type-species of *Hoplothrips* regardless of Karny's misidentification. My original solution for *Phlaeothrips* is still acceptable under Article 70a(iii), regardless of Blanchard's misidentification.

However, because the bulk of literature on *Phlaeothrips* is based on *coriaceous* Haliday and much modern literature on *Hoplothrips* is based on *corticis* De Geer, according to the zoological concepts currently applied to these species, and because most thysanopterists continue to reject *Thrips ulmi* as being the proper type-species for *Phlaeothrips* for reasons within or without the limits of any Rules or Codes, nomenclatural stability and uniformity would be favoured by adopting Mound's suggestions.

Accordingly I yield to the dictates of my fellow thysanopterists in these matters and recommend that Mound's requests be adopted.

REFERENCE

(in addition to those given by Mound)

HOOD, J. D. 1915. *Hoplothrips corticis*: A problem in nomenclature. *The Entomologist* 48 : 102-107.

COMMENT ON PROPOSED EMENDATION OF THE CODE TO COVER
DESIGNATION OF TYPES FROM DOUBTFULLY SYNTYPICAL MATERIAL.
Z.N.(S.) 1571

(see volume 23, pages 110-113)

By Ernst Mayr (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*)

I strongly endorse the views expressed by Mr. Boeseman concerning the question whether the neotype or lectotype definition in the Code should be modified in order to cope with situations as described by Lockett.

As Boeseman states correctly such cases can be handled quite well by the modification of the definition of lectotypes as suggested by him. To water down the definition of neotypes as well as to weaken the provisions for the designation of neotypes would open the door to the wholesale creation of neotypes.

It must be remembered that the concept of types was exceedingly vague until the middle of the last century and it was standard practice to add "typical specimens" to the original type series. This was completely consistent with the Aristotelian concept of "typical" adhered to by Linnaeus and his followers.

As a matter of fact, the procedure proposed by Boeseman has on the whole been standard practice among zoologists for many generations. This, indeed, includes lectotypes based on so-called Linnaean material.